

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed January 4, 2008 (Paper No. 20071211). Upon entry of this response, claims 1-2, 4, 10-24, 55-56, 58, 72-114, 116-215, and 236-247 are pending in the application. In this response, claims 1, 13-14, 20, 55, 72, 210, and 247 have been amended, and claims 216-235 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments being filed herewith be entered and request that there be reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Claim Objections

Claims 13-14 and 20 are objected to because “these claims depend from a cancelled claim (claim 3)”. (Office Action, p. 7.) The objected-to claims are amended herein to depend from claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection is overcome, and request that the objection be withdrawn.

2. Rejection of Claims 72-73, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 210-211, 214, 216-217, 220-221, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 72-73, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 210-211, 214, 216-217, 220-221, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 are rejected under §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 72, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 210-211, and 214 is overcome by claim amendments made herein, and that the rejection of claims 216-217, 220-221, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 is rendered moot by claim cancellation. A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See, e.g., *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

a. Independent Claim 72

Claim 72 is amended to recite “logic configured to store information identifying at least one management IP address, the at least one **management** IP address being assigned to the RF cable network device; ... logic configured to translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the at least one CPE data device to a NAT process IP address **such that the NAT process IP address has a subnet different than the management IP address**” (emphasis added). Applicant can find no discussion of network address translation in *Edson*, and respectfully submits that *Edson* fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the feature recited above. For at least the reason that *Edson* fails to disclose, teach or suggest this feature, Applicant respectfully submits that *Edson* does not anticipate claim 72. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 72 be withdrawn.

b. Independent Claim 210

Claim 210 is amended to recite “storing information identifying at least one management IP address, the at least one **management** IP address being assigned to the RF cable network device and used to manage the RF cable network device; ... translating an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the at least one CPE data device to a NAT process IP address **such that the NAT process IP address has a subnet different than the management IP address**” (emphasis added). Applicant can find no discussion of network address translation in *Edson*, and respectfully submits that *Edson* fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the feature recited above. For at least the reason that *Edson* fails to disclose, teach or suggest this feature, Applicant respectfully submits that *Edson* does not anticipate claim 210. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 210 be withdrawn.

c. Claims 216-217, 220-221, 226, 230-231, and 234-235

Claims 216-217, 220-221, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicant

takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicant expressly reserves the right to present cancelled claims 216-217, 220-221, 226, 230-231, and 234-235, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

d. Dependent Claims 73, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 211, and 214

Since independent claims 72 and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 73, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 211, and 214 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 73, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 211, and 214 be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 20, 55-56, 74-79, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 212-213, 228, and 236-247 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4, 20, 55-56, 74-79, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 212-213, 228, and 236-247 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 20, 55-56, 74-79, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 212-213, 228, and 236-247 is overcome by claim amendments made herein, and that the rejection of claim 228 is rendered moot by claim cancellation. It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

a. Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended to recite “logic configured to manage the at least one RF cable interface through a management IP address assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device; ... network address translation (NAT) logic configured to translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device to a second IP address such that the second IP address has a subnet different than the management IP address”. Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of *Edson* and *Cameron* fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least this feature.

Applicant can find no discussion of network address translation in *Edson*. *Cameron* contains a brief discussion of network address translation:

NAT Network Address Translation. An Internet standard that enables a local-area network (LAN) to use one set of IP addresses for internal traffic and a second set of addresses for external traffic. A NAT box located where the LAN meets the Internet makes all necessary IP address translations. NATs serve two main purposes: They provide a type of firewall by hiding internal IP addresses and they enable a company to use more internal IP addresses. Since they're only used internally, there's no possibility of conflict with IP addresses used by other companies and organizations.

(*Cameron*, para. 0091)

The Office Action (p. 15) appears to allege that the internal address in *Cameron* corresponds to a IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device, and that the external address in *Cameron* corresponds to a second IP address having a subnet different than the first IP address. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Even assuming (for the sake of argument) that the different “sets” of IP addresses used for internal and external addresses in *Cameron* refer to different subnets, this does not teach the specific feature recited in amended claim 1: network address translation logic configured to translate “such that the second IP address has a subnet different than the **management IP address**”.

Applicant notes that other portions of claim 1 further describe the management IP address: “logic configured to manage the at least one RF cable interface through a

management IP address assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device”. Applicant can find no teaching in *Cameron* of such a management IP address as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action (p. 14) alleges that the “address stored in the firewall” in *Edson* (Col. 9, lines 42-45) corresponds to an IP address assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device and used to manage the at least one RF cable interface. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of *Edson*.

Edson teaches, at most, that an IP address is associated with the firewall, and that IP address is used as a source address for translated packets: “[a]s part of the application level protection, the firewall might also readdress out-going packets so that the packets appear to originate from a single address associated with the firewall 101”. (*Edson*, Col. 9, lines 42-45.) However, an IP address associated with a firewall is not the same as address which is used “to manage the at least one RF cable interface” as recited in claim 1.

Thus, the proposed combination of *Edson* in view of *Cameron* does not teach at least the features described above that are recited in amended claim 1. Since the proposed combination does not teach at least the above-described features, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection has not been made. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious under the proposed combination of *Edson* in view of *Cameron*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

b. Independent Claim 55

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 55 is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Edson* in view of *Cameron* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of “storing a management IP address that is assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device and used to manage the RF cable interface; ... translating an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device to a

NAT process IP address such that the NAT process IP address has a subnet different than the management IP address”.

Applicant can find no discussion of network address translation in *Edson*. *Cameron* contains a brief discussion of network address translation:

NAT Network Address Translation. An Internet standard that enables a local-area network (LAN) to use one set of IP addresses for internal traffic and a second set of addresses for external traffic. A NAT box located where the LAN meets the Internet makes all necessary IP address translations. NATs serve two main purposes: They provide a type of firewall by hiding internal IP addresses and they enable a company to use more internal IP addresses. Since they're only used internally, there's no possibility of conflict with IP addresses used by other companies and organizations.

(*Cameron*, para. 0091)

The Office Action (p. 15) appears to allege that the internal address in *Cameron* corresponds to a IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device, and that the external address in *Cameron* corresponds to a second IP address having a subnet different than the first IP address. Applicants respectfully disagree. Even assuming (for the sake of argument) that the different “sets” of IP addresses used for internal and external addresses in *Cameron* refer to different subnets, this does not teach the specific feature recited in amended claim 55: network address translation logic configured to translate “such that the second IP address has a subnet different than the **management IP address**”.

Applicant notes that other portions of claim 55 further describe the management IP address: “storing a management IP address assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device and used to manage the RF cable interface”. Applicant can find no teaching in *Cameron* of such a management IP address as recited in amended claim 55. The Office Action (p. 14) alleges that the “address stored in the firewall” in *Edson* (Col. 9, lines 42-45) corresponds to an IP address assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device and used to manage the at least one RF cable interface. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of *Edson*.

Edson teaches, at most, that an IP address is associated with the firewall, and that IP address is used as a source address for translated packets: “[a]s part of the application level protection, the firewall might also readdress out-going packets so that the packets appear to originate from a single address associated with the firewall 101”. (*Edson*, Col. 9, lines 42-45.) However, an IP address associated with a firewall is not the same as address which is used “to manage the at least one RF cable interface” as recited in claim 55.

Thus, the proposed combination of *Edson* in view of *Cameron* does not teach at least the features described above that are recited in amended claim 55. Since the proposed combination does not teach at least the above-described features, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection has not been made. Therefore, claim 55 is not obvious under the proposed combination of *Edson* in view of *Cameron*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

c. Claim 228

Claim 228 is cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of this claim is therefore rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of this cancelled claim in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicant expressly reserves the right to present cancelled claim 228, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

d. Dependent Claims 2, 4, 20, 56, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 212-213, and 236-247

As argued above in sections 2.a, 3.a, and 3.b, independent claims 1, 55, 72, 210, and are allowable (as argued above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4, 20, 56, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 212-213, and 236-247 are allowable for at least the reason that each

depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 20, 56, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 212-213, and 236-247 be withdrawn.

4. Rejection of Claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and further in view of *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The deficiencies of *Edson* were discussed above in connection with independent claim 72, and the deficiencies of *Edson* and *Cameron* discussed above in connection with independent claim 1. The addition of *Na* does not cure these deficiencies. Therefore, since independent claims 1 and 72 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 be withdrawn.

5. Rejection of Claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The deficiencies of *Edson* were discussed above in connection with independent claim 72, and the deficiencies of *Edson* and *Cameron* discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 55. The addition of *Nazarathy* does not cure these deficiencies. Therefore, since independent claims 1, 55, and 72 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d

1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 be withdrawn.

6. Rejection of Claims 93-94, 100, 104-106, 112, 116-117, and 123 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 93-94, 100, 104-106, 112, 116-117, and 123 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Hooper* (U.S. 5,414,455). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The deficiencies of *Edson* were discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. The addition of *Cameron* and *Hooper* does not cure these deficiencies. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 93-94, 100, 104-106, 112, 116-117, and 123 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 93-94, 100, 104-106, 112, 116-117, and 123 be withdrawn.

7. Rejection of Claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Hooper* (U.S. 5,414,455) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The deficiencies of *Edson* were discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. The addition of *Cameron* and *Hooper* and *Nazrathy* does not cure these deficiencies. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 be withdrawn.

8. Rejection of Claim 129 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 129 is rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Bowser* (U.S. 6,870,570). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Bowser* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 129 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 129 be withdrawn.

9. Rejection of Claim 139 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 139 is rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Okano* (U.S. 2002/0062485). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Bowser* and *Okano* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 139 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 139 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 139 be withdrawn.

10. Rejection of Claims 140-144 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 140-144 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Okano* (U.S. 2002/0062485) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Okano* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 140-144 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends

from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 140-144 be withdrawn.

11. Rejection of Claims 151-155, 157-159, 181, and 185 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 151-155, 157-159, 181, and 185 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Na* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 151-155, 157-159, 181, and 185 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 151-155, 157-159, 181, and 185 be withdrawn.

12. Rejection of Claims 162-164, 168, and 170 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 162-164, 168, and 170 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 162-164, 168, and 170 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 162-164, 168, and 170 be withdrawn.

13. Rejection of Claims 175-176 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 175-176 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Tseng* (U.S. 5,582,714). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The

addition of *Tseng* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 175-176 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 175-176 be withdrawn.

14. Rejection of Claims 177 and 183 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 177 and 183 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Tseng* (U.S. 5,582,714) and further in view of *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Tseng* and *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 177 and 183 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 177 and 183 be withdrawn.

15. Rejection of Claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785) and further in view of *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Na* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 be withdrawn.

16. Rejection of Claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72 and 210. Therefore, since independent claims 72 and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 be withdrawn.

17. Rejection of Claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 be withdrawn.

18. Rejection of Claims 192 and 196 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 192 and 196 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and further in view of *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727) and *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Nazarathy* and *Cameron* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed

above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 192 and 196 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 192 and 196 be withdrawn.

19. Rejection of Claims 200 and 206 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 200 and 206 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 200 and 206 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 200 and 206 be withdrawn.

20. Rejection of Claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Na* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 be withdrawn.

21. Rejection of Claims 204 and 208 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 204 and 208 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785) and *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727) and *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Na* and *Nazarathy* and *Cameron* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 204 and 208 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 204 and 208 be withdrawn.

22. Rejection of Claims 218-219 and 232-233 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 218-219 and 232-233 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Okano* (U.S. 2002/0062485). Claims 218-219 and 232-233 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicant expressly reserves the right to present cancelled claims 218-219 and 232-233, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

23. Rejection of Claims 222-225, 227, and 229 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 222-225, 227, and 229 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Okano* (U.S. 2002/0062485) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Claims 222-225, 227, and 229 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the

rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicant expressly reserves the right to present claims 222-225, 227, and 229, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 1-2, 4, 10-24, 55-56, 58, 72-114, 116-215, and 236-247 be allowed to issue. Any statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Karen G. Hazzah/

Karen G. Hazzah, Reg. No. 48,472

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

600 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933